



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/809,581

03/16/2001

Leo J. Campbell

08049.0005

5903

22852

7590

05/15/2006

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/809,581	Applicant(s) CAMPBELL ET AL.	
	Examiner Benjamin R. Bruckart	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-27, 50-59, 69, 70, 76, 77 and 79-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-27, 50-59, 69, 70, 76, 77 and 79-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Claims 18-27, 50-59, 69, 70, 76, 77, 79-91 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 18, 20-21, 23-24, 26, 50, 52-53, 55-56, 58, 69-70, 76 and 77 are amended.

Claims 79-91 are new.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/06 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Terms "seven digit zip code" and "alias" are not found in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 18, 23, 50, 55, 69, 70, 76, 77, 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains

subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 18, 50, 69 and 76 claim limitations and arguments define the standardized physical address including a "7-digit ZIP code". Nowhere in applicant's specification does he mention a seven-digit zip code. Claims 23, 55, 70, and 77 claim a limitation defining the standardized electronic address is an "alias." The examiner cannot find the word "alias" in applicant's specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18, 23, 50, 55, 69, 70, 76, 77, 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 18, 23, 50, 55, 69, 70, 76, 77, 87 recites the limitations "seven-digit zip code" and "alias." The examiner believes the seven-digit zip code may be an error as amended and argued and could be 9 digit. The term "alias" is broad and indefinite and not defined in the specification.

Claims 18-20, 22, 50-52, 54 and 55-57, 59, 69 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 18, the King reference teaches a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user's electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23);

determining a standardized physical address of the user from the electronic address using an address database (King: page 2, para 22-23); and

delivering the message to the user (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30),

The King reference fails to teach 5 digit and 7 digit zip codes.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches converting a non-standardized physical address includes a 5-digit ZIP code and the standardized physical address includes a 7 digit ZIP code (Whitehouse: col. 6, lines 50-68) in order to further identify the destination address (Whitehouse: col. 2, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for delivering a message as taught by King to include standardizing zip codes with zip+4 codes in order to further identify the destination address.

Regarding claim 19, the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the electronic address (King: page 2, para 30).

Regarding claim 20, the method of claim 18, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the standardized physical address (King: page 2-3, para 31-32).

Regarding claim 22, the method of claim 18, wherein the address database is a United States Postal Service address database (King: page 2, para 22).

Claims 50-52, 54, 69 and 76 are rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Claims 23-25, 27, 55-57, 59, 70 and 77; 79-82, 84-86, 88, 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al.

Regarding claim 23, the King reference teaches a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes a non-standardized electronic address of the user and a physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23);

determining a standardized electronic address of the user from the physical address using an address database (King: page 2, para 22-23); and

delivering the message to the user (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30), wherein the standardized electronic address is an alias with respect to the non-standardized electronic address (King: page 2, para 20).

Regarding claim 24, the method of claim 23, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the standardized electronic address (King: page 2, para 30).

Regarding claim 25, the method of claim 23, further comprising the step of: delivering the message to the user at the physical address (King: page 2-3, para 31-32).

Regarding claim 27, the method of claim 23, wherein the address database is a United States Postal Service address database (King: page 2, para 22).

Claims 55-57, 59, 70 and 77 are rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Regarding claim 79, a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user's electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

determining a delivery point identification key that points to a location in an address database, the location associated with a standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2, para 22; the keys you search by).

Regarding claim 80, the method of claim 79, further comprising:

delivering the message to the user at the standardized physical address, the delivering based on the delivery point identification key (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30).

Regarding claim 81, a method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising the steps of:

receiving the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes a non-standardized electronic address and a physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

determining a delivery point identification key that points to a location in an address database, the location associated with a standardized electronic address of the user (King: page 2, para 22; the keys you search by).

Regarding claim 82, the method of claim 81, further comprising:

delivering the message to the user at the standardized electronic address, the delivering based on the delivery point identification key (King: page 2, para 22-23, 30).

Regarding claim 84, the method of claim 81, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a telephone number (King: page 2, para 22).

Regarding claim 85, the method of claim 81, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a vanity e-mail address (King: page 2, para 22).

Regarding claim 86, a system for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising:

- a receiving component configured to receive the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an electronic address associated with the user's electronic account and a non-standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

- a determining component configured to determine a delivery point identification key that points to a location in an address database, the location associated with a standardized physical address of the user (King: page 2, para 22; the keys you search by).

Regarding claim 88, a system for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), comprising:

- a receiving component configured to receive the message directed to the user with the electronic account (King: pages 1-2, para 18-20), where the message includes an non-standardized electronic address of the user and a physical address of the user (King: page 2; para 22-23); and

- a determining component configured to determine a delivery point identification key that points to a location in an address database (King: page 2, para 22; the keys you search by),

- the location associated with a standardized electronic address of the user (King: page 2, para 22).

Regarding claim 90, the system of claim 88, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a telephone number (King: page 2, para 22).

Regarding claim 91, the system of claim 88, wherein the standardized electronic address includes a vanity e-mail address (King: page 2, para 22).

Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 87, the King reference teaches the system of claim 86. The King reference fails to teach 5 and 7 digit zip codes.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches converting a non-standardized physical address includes a 5-digit ZIP code and the standardized physical address includes a 7 digit ZIP code (Whitehouse: col. 6, lines 50-68) in order to further identify the destination address (Whitehouse: col. 2, lines 50-60).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method for delivering a message as taught by King to include standardizing zip codes with zip+4 codes in order to further identify the destination address.

Claims 21, 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 21, the King and '505 references teach the method for delivering a message to a user with an electronic account.

The King and '505 references does not explicitly state sending back information of a standardized physical address.

However the Whitehouse reference teaches sending back information of a complete physical address (Whitehouse: col. 6, lines 52-58) in order to providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of delivering a message as taught by King to include informing the sender of a complete address as taught by Whitehouse in order to remove the last barrier for automation providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

Claim 53 is rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Claims 26, 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,341,505 by Whitehouse.

Regarding claim 26, the King reference teaches the method of claim 23.

The King reference does not teach informing the sender of the complete electronic address. However the Whitehouse reference teaches informing the sender of the standardized electronic address (Whitehouse: col. 6, lines 52-58) in order to providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of delivering a message as taught by King to include informing the sender of a complete address as taught by Whitehouse in order to remove the last barrier for automation providing quick, easy, and low cost lookup for complete address information (Whitehouse: col. 5, lines 57- col. 6, line 5).

Claim 58 is rejected under the same grounds as being substantially similar in subject matter and scope.

Claims 83 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0002590 by King et al.

Regarding claim 83, the King reference teaches the method of claim 81. The King reference fails to teach fax numbers. However, the King reference teaches telephone numbers and messages routed to a printer so that the user can receive a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of delivering messages as taught by King to include a facsimile number in order to provide the user with a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32)

Regarding claim 89, the King reference teaches the system of claim 88. The King reference fails to teach fax numbers. However, the King reference teaches telephone numbers and messages routed to a printer so that the user can receive a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of delivering messages as taught by King to include a facsimile number in order to provide the user with a hardcopy (King: page 3, para 32).

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the independent claims to further clarify nonstandard and standard physical addresses.

PRIOR ART

U.S. Patent No. 6,711,624 by Narurkar et al teaches mapping addresses with electronic accounts (col. 29, lines 49-59; Figures 11A and 11B).

U.S. Patent No. 5,387,783 by Mihm et al teaches locating ZIP codes of destinations and appending a zip code (col. 2, lines 25-30).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Benjamin R Bruckart

Examiner

Art Unit 2155

brb

brb


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER